1	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	
4	HONORABLE WILLIAM V. GALLO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE PRESIDING
5	
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
7	PLAINTIFF,)
8	vs. , NO.10CR1372W
9	JONATHAN LEAL-DEL CARMEN,)
10	DEFENDANT.)
11	
12	
13	MOTION HEARING
14	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS JUNE 10, 2010
15	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
16	
17	MELISSA A. PIERSON, CSR 12499, RPR
18	FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 940 FRONT STREET, ROOM 3155
19	SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101 PH: (619)702-7508
20	PIERSON1121@SBCGLOBAL.NET
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
1
      APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
 2
      ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF:
                LAURA DUFFY
 3
                UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
                BY: MR. STEVE MILLER, ESQ.
 4
                ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS
                880 FRONT STREET
 5
                FIFTH FLOOR
                SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
 6
 7
      ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT DEL CARMEN:
                FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF SAN DIEGO
 8
                BY: MR. JASON SER, ESQ.
                C/O: MR. HANNI FAKHOURY, ESQ.
 9
                225 W. BROADWAY
                ST. 900
10
                SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
                (619) 234-8467
11
      ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANT GOMEZ:
12
                MR. ROBERT CARRIEDO, ESQ.
                105 W. "F" STREET
13
                ST. 300
                SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
14
                (619) 232-0900
15
      ON BEHALF OF MATERIAL WITNESSES:
                MR. THOMAS G. GILMORE, ESQ.
16
                14020 LAKE POWAY ROAD
                POWAY, CA 92064
                (858) 922-0826
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 MADAM CLERK: 10CR1372, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 2 VERSUS JONATHAN LEAL-DEL CARMEN AND DOMINGO GOMEZ-AGUILAR. 3 MS. SER: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR. JASON SER, FEDERAL DEFENDERS, STANDING IN FOR HANNI FAKHOURY, ON BEHALF 4 OF MR. LEAL-DEL CARMEN, WHO'S IN CUSTODY. 5 MR. CARRIEDO: GOOD AFTERNOON, ROBERT CARRIEDO ON 6 7 BEHALF OF MR. GOMEZ, WHO'S IN COURT. MR. GILMORE: GOOD AFTERNOON, YOUR HONOR, TOM 8 9 GILMORE ON BEHALF OF THE MATERIAL WITNESSES. 10 THE COURT: GOOD AFTERNOON. GOOD AFTERNOON, 11 GENTLEMEN. 12 THE DEFENDANTS: GOOD AFTERNOON. 13 THE COURT: MR. LEAL-DEL CARMEN, IS THAT YOU, SIR? 14 YOUR ATTORNEY, MR. FAKHOURY, IS NOT PRESENT IN COURT THIS 15 AFTERNOON. STANDING IN FOR HIM IS ONE OF HIS COLLEAGUES, MR. SER, WHO'S RIGHT THERE IN FRONT OF YOU. HE'S AGREED TO 16 17 REPRESENT YOU FOR THESE PROCEEDINGS THAT ARE ABOUT TO OCCUR, 18 WHICH IS A MOTION HEARING FOR TAKING THE DEPOSITION OF A 19 MATERIAL WITNESS. 20 BEFORE WE PROCEED ANY FURTHER, HOWEVER, I NEED TO HEAR FROM YOU WHETHER YOU ARE COMFORTABLE AND AGREE TO HAVE 21 22 MR. SER REPRESENT YOU FOR PURPOSES OF TODAY'S HEARING. YOUR 23 ATTORNEY WILL STILL BE MR. FAKHOURY, BUT FOR TODAY'S HEARING 24 DO YOU AGREE, CONSENT TO ALLOWING MR. SER TO REPRESENT YOU? 25 DEFT. LEAL-DEL CARMEN: YES, I AGREE.

1 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. GILMORE. 2 MR. GILMORE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. YOUR HONOR, WHEN WE WERE HERE BEFORE, YOUR HONOR GRANTED THE MOTION FOR A 4 DEPOSITION, BUT SET TODAY'S DATE FOR -- TO SCHEDULE THAT 5 DEPOSITION, CONTINGENT UPON WHAT WOULD HAPPEN WITH THE HEARING BEFORE JUDGE WHELAN A FEW DAYS AGO. IT'S MY 6 7 UNDERSTANDING THAT THAT HEARING, WHICH WAS SOLELY TO SET THE 8 TRIAL, AND I BELIEVE, MOTION TO PRESERVE EVIDENCE, HAD 9 NOTHING REALLY WHATSOEVER TO DO WITH THE DEPOSITION, HAS BEEN 10 CONTINUED A COUPLE OF DAYS, I THINK UNTIL THE 12TH, IF I'M CORRECT. SO, I THINK WE'RE IN THE POSITION OF -- THE LAW IS 11 12 CLEAR THAT MY CLIENTS HAVE A RIGHT TO BE DEPOSED. THEY HAVE 13 ALREADY BEEN IN CUSTODY, I BELIEVE, SINCE MARCH 25TH. YOUR 14 HONOR GAVE A LONG EXTENSION FROM THE LAST TIME WE BROUGHT THE 15 MOTION UNTIL TODAY. I THINK IT'S TIME TO SCHEDULE THE DEPO 16 AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. I WOULD SUGGEST SOMETIME NEXT WEEK, 17 PERHAPS A TUESDAY OR THURSDAY IS GOOD WITH MY CALENDAR, AND I 18 BELIEVE WITH ONE OF THE DEFENSE COUNSEL, I'M NOT SURE. THE COURT: WELL, JUNE 12TH WOULD BE A SATURDAY, 19 20 AND I HAVE JULY 12TH AS WHEN THEY CONTINUED THE MOTION 21 HEARING. 22 MR. GILMORE: ALL THE MORE REASON THEN. 23 THE COURT: MR. CARRIEDO OR MR. SER, ANY RESPONSE? 24 MR. SER: YOUR HONOR, JUST BRIEFLY, IN OPPOSITION, 25 AND I DON'T KNOW, I BELIEVE MR. FAKHOURY FILED A RESPONSE IN

1 OPPOSITION TO THE REQUEST HERE. 2 THE COURT: YES, HE DID. I'VE READ IT. MR. SER: OKAY. ONE THING TO POINT OUT, I JUST 3 TOOK A LOOK AT -- GLANCED AT MR. GILMORE'S DECLARATION. I 4 DON'T KNOW IF THAT'S SPECIFIC ENOUGH TO TRIGGER THE RIGHT OF 5 THE DEPOSITION UNDER A NINTH CIRCUIT PRECEDENT. IT CERTAINLY 6 7 DOESN'T IDENTIFY THE LACK OF ANY ALTERNATE SOURCES OF SUPPORT OR INCOME FOR THE FAMILY MEMBERS REMAINING IN MEXICO RELATED 8 9 TO THE MATERIAL WITNESS OR WITNESSES IN THE CASE. 10 SO, I DON'T NECESSARILY THINK THAT THE THRESHOLD HAS BEEN MET HERE. I UNDERSTAND THERE IS A HARDSHIP, BUT 11 12 THIS IS A HARDSHIP THAT THE MATERIAL WITNESS FACED WHETHER 13 THEY WERE CHARGED AS A MATERIAL WITNESS OR AS A 1326 DEFENDANT. BUT JUST LOOKING AT THE DECLARATION, I DON'T KNOW 14 15 IF THAT'S SPECIFIC ENOUGH. I CERTAINLY WOULD SUBMIT IT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT PRECEDENT ON 16 17 THE MATTER. THE COURT: OKAY. MR. CARRIEDO, ANYTHING FURTHER? 18 19 MR. CARRIEDO: NOTHING FURTHER. 20 I WOULD ONLY POINT OUT THAT IT'S KIND OF MAYBE TRIVIAL, BUT THE COURT'S WORDING WAS YOU WERE INCLINED TO 21 GRANT THE MOTION LAST TIME. I DON'T THINK YOU OFFICIALLY 22 23 GRANTED THE MOTION.

THE COURT: I THINK THAT'S PROBABLY WHAT I SAID,
BUT I SUPPOSE WE CAN GO BACK AND READ THE RECORD, BUT I

24

25

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROBABLY SAID I AM INCLINED TO BECAUSE I WASN'T PREPARED TO RULE ON IT THAT DAY, AND I WAS JUST SORT OF TELEGRAPHING MY INTENT. BUT BE THAT AS IT MAY, WHAT I SAID THEN, YOU KNOW, I THINK I STILL HAD THE PREROGATIVE TO CHANGE MY MIND IF I THINK THAT'S APPROPRIATE BECAUSE WE ARE NOW AT THIS POINT IN TIME. SO, MR. MILLER, ARE YOU HERE ON THIS CASE? MR. MILLER: YES, YOUR HONOR. STEVE MILLER FOR THE UNITED STATES. I WOULD SUBMIT TO THE COURT WHETHER TO SCHEDULE THE DEPOSITIONS AS WE DISCUSSED AT THE LAST HEARING, THIS IS A LITTLE DIFFERENT THAN THE TRADITIONAL ALIEN SMUGGLING CASE THAT WASN'T A VEHICLE STOP. IT WAS OUT IN THE FIELD. AND REALLY MY ONLY CONCERN ISN'T WHETHER OR NOT WE'RE GOING TO DO THE DEPOSITIONS, BUT TO HAVE THIS COURT GRANT THE AUTHORITY TO DO THE DEPOSITION OF ANY MATERIAL WITNESS WHO MAY BE OUT ON BOND. THAT'S THE ONLY CONCERN THAT THE GOVERNMENT HAS. THE COURT: THERE ARE ADDITIONAL MATERIAL WITNESSES OTHER THAN THE THREE THAT ARE BEING REPRESENTED BY MR. GILMORE. MR. GILMORE: NO, AND SINCE THE LAST HEARING ONE HAS BEEN RELEASED ON BOND AND WE'RE TRYING TO GET AT LEAST ONE OF THE OTHER ONE'S OUT. I CAN'T SAY THAT THEY WILL BE RELEASED. THE COURT: WHICH ONE HAS BEEN RELEASED? MR. GILMORE: REESTIO (PHONETIC) VAZQUEZ-ROJAS.

THE COURT: OKAY. SIR, I APPRECIATE YOUR COMMENT THAT PERHAPS THE DECLARATION OF MR. GILMORE DOESN'T GO INTO EXCRUCIATING DETAIL ABOUT THE EFFORTS MADE BY THE MATERIAL WITNESSES TO SECURE FUNDING FOR THE BOND, BUT I THINK IT'S CERTAINLY SUFFICIENT AND IT DOES STATE THAT THEY SIMPLY CANNOT LOCATE ANYONE TO POST BOND FOR THEM. INTERPRETED BROADLY, IF THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE GETTING AT, THAT WOULD MEAN ANYONE NEAR SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA, UNITED STATES, MEXICO OR ANYWHERE ELSE. ALTHOUGH IT DOES APPEAR AT LEAST ONE PERSON HAS BEEN ABLE, SINCE THIS DECLARATION WAS FILED ON THE 28TH OF APRIL, TO FIND SOMEONE.

MR. GILMORE: WHICH WOULD BE ALL THE MORE REASON
THAT THE DEFENSE WILL HAVE A LIVE WITNESS AT TRIAL, IF
NECESSARY, AND ALL THE MORE REASON TO DEPOSE THE REMAINING
TWO THAT ARE IN CUSTODY OVER THREE MONTHS.

MR. SER: YOUR HONOR, MY ONLY NOTATION WASN'T SO MUCH BASED ON INTENT TO FIND A SURETY, IT WAS REALLY POINTED SOLELY AT WHETHER OR NOT THE MATERIAL WITNESSES CAN SHOW A HARDSHIP REQUIRED TO JUSTIFY THE DEPOSITION, AND THAT'S WHY I POINTED OUT THAT THE DECLARATION DOESN'T DISCUSS WHETHER THOSE FAMILY MEMBERS REMAINING IN MEXICO HAVE ALTERNATE MEANS OF SUPPORT. THE MATERIAL WITNESSES, WHEN THEY DEPART, I'M GUESSING, THE HOME, AND TRAVEL AND MAKE THEIR WAY TO THE UNITED STATES, UM, DON'T LEAVE THEIR MINOR CHILDREN AT HOME BY THEMSELVES. I'M GUESSING THERE ARE OTHER ADULTS

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

SUPERVISING THE CHILDREN, WATCHING THEM AND MAKING SURE THEIR DAILY NEEDS ARE MET. BUT THERE IS NO INDICATION CRUCIALLY THAT THOSE ADULTS SUPERVISING OR CARING FOR THE CHILDREN CAN'T PROVIDE THE BASIC NECESSITIES BASED ON THEIR OWN INCOME, THEIR OWN ASSETS, WHATEVER PROPERTY THEY MAY HAVE IN TERMS OF PUTTING A ROOF OVER THEIR HEAD. AND I DON'T THINK NECESSARILY THE HARDSHIP HERE HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY THE NINTH CIRCUIT. CERTAINLY IN TORRES THERE WAS AN INDICATION ABOUT SOLE INCOME IN THE HOME. THERE HAS BEEN NO IDENTIFICATION WHATSOEVER WHETHER OR NOT THE MATERIAL WITNESSES REMAINING IN CUSTODY ARE SOLE PROVIDERS FOR FAMILY MEMBERS REMAINING IN MEXICO, WHETHER THEY WERE THE ONLY ONES WHO WORKED. SO, IN THAT SENSE, MY POSITION WAS THEY HADN'T MET THE THRESHOLD TO DEMONSTRATE THE HARDSHIP. THE COURT: MR. MILLER, YOU HAD INDICATED THAT THE LAST TIME WE WERE HERE, AND AGAIN TODAY, THAT THIS IS NOT THE TYPICAL RUN-OF-THE-MILL CASE, BUT GIVE ME A LITTLE MORE FACTS, IF YOU CAN. MR. MILLER: IF YOU HAD REVIEWED THE AFFIDAVIT IN SUPPORT OF THE COMPLAINT IN THIS CASE, WHAT HAD HAPPENED --THE COURT: I DID, BUT THAT WAS SOME TIME AGO. REFRESH MY MEMORY. MR. MILLER: SO, THE BORDER PATROL WAS PATROLLING AND THEY FOUND A GROUP OF ALIENS. THESE ALIENS TOLD THE BORDER PATROL THAT THEY HAD BEEN GUIDED INTO THE UNITED

STATES AND THAT WHEN -- THE PEOPLE WHO HAD BEEN GUIDING THEM
LEFT. AND WHAT THE BORDER PATROL AGENTS DID IS THEY HAD
TRACKED THEM WITH FOOTPRINTS AND SIDE CUTTING THROUGH THE
WILDERNESS. THEY HAD SEARCHED FOR A NUMBER OF HOURS FOR
PEOPLE AFTER HAVING FOLLOWED THE FOOTPRINTS THAT THE GROUP
HAD IDENTIFIED AS BELONGING TO THE TWO GUIDES THAT CROSSED
THEM IN.

THEY WERE NOT ABLE TO FIND THEM. THE SUN CAME UP AND THEN THE SCOPE OPERATOR RADIOED THOSE BORDER PATROL AGENTS AND SAID THERE ARE TWO PEOPLE WHO WERE IN THAT AREA THAT YOU WERE LOOKING FOR, WHICH YOU WERE TRACKING THAT GROUPS POTENTIAL GUIDES, AND THEY ARE IN THIS AREA, AND THEY HAVE A NICKNAME, I FORGET WHAT IT WAS. I ALMOST REMEMBERED WHAT IT WAS, BUT I COULDN'T STATE WHAT THE NICKNAME IS ACCURATELY.

AND SO, THEN BORDER PATROL AGENTS WENT THERE AND FOUND THE DEFENDANTS, AND THEN THEY COMPARED THE SOLES OF THEIR SHOES AND RECOGNIZED THEM AS THE SAME PATTERN AS THE GUIDES -- AS THE TRACK THAT THEY HAD BEEN TRACKING FROM THE AREA WHERE THEY HAD APPREHENDED THE GROUP.

AND THEN, SUBSEQUENT TO THAT, THE MATERIAL WITNESSES WERE INTERVIEWED, AND THEN, I BELIEVE, IN A PHOTO LINEUP, IDENTIFIED THE DEFENDANTS AS THE PEOPLE WHO WERE THEIR GUIDE AND WHO LEFT THE GROUP. AND I THINK ALSO INSTRUCTED THEM ON WHAT TO DO, TO STAY.

1 THE COURT: OKAY. AND WHY WAS THE MOTION HEARING, WHICH WAS SET FOR A FEW DAYS AGO, CONTINUED? 2 3 MR. MILLER: THIS WAS FOR FURTHER DISPOSITION, 4 ACTUALLY. 5 MR. CARRIEDO: THERE IS ALSO -- I DON'T MEAN TO INTERRUPT YOU, THERE WAS A REQUEST BY MR. FAKHOURY FOR SOME 6 7 ADDITIONAL DISCOVERY OF THE GOVERNMENT THAT I'M NOT SURE IF IT'S GOING TO BE VOLUMINOUS, BUT THERE WAS SOME ADDITIONAL 8 9 DISCOVERY THAT HE FELT WAS NECESSARY BEFORE HE COULD PROCEED WITH THE MOTIONS. 10 MR. MILLER: WHAT HAD BEEN REPRESENTED TO ME, 11 MR. FAKHOURY, WHAT HE WANTED, AND HE HAD NOT MADE THIS 12 13 SPECIFIC REQUEST TO ME UNTIL LAST MONDAY, THAT HE WANTED A 14 COLOR COPY OF THE PHOTO AND I DON'T HAVE THAT. 15 THE COURT: OKAY. MR. CARRIEDO: AND I DO KNOW MR. FAKHOURY WAS OUT 16 17 OF THE OFFICE FOR A FEW WEEKS AND HE WAS BACK ON THE MONDAY 18 OF THE MOTION HEARING DATE. MAYBE THAT'S WHY THE REQUEST 19 HADN'T BEEN MADE SPECIFICALLY. 20 THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. MR. GILMORE, MR. SER MAKES THE ARGUMENT THAT THE DECLARATION THAT'S PROVIDED BY 21 22 YOU IS INADEQUATE TO SATISFY THE NINTH CIRCUIT DECISION IN 23 TORRES-RUIZ, IN THAT THERE IS NO INDICATION IN THE 24 DECLARATION THAT THERE WOULD BE ANY HARDSHIP SUFFERED BY THE 25 MATERIAL WITNESSES' FAMILIES BY THE CONTINUED DETENTION.

NOW, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT'S SAID IN TORRES-RUIZ.

I'M NOT SO SURE THAT THAT IS THE DETERMINATIVE FACTOR WHEN

YOU COMPARE ALL ALONG THE STATUTES AND THE RULES. WHAT

APPEARS TO BE IMPORTANT, PERHAPS MORE SO THAN WITH THE

MATERIAL WITNESSES' FAMILY OR THE MATERIAL WITNESSES

THEMSELVES, WOULD BE SUFFERING SUBSTANTIAL HARDSHIP IS

WHETHER THERE BE A FAILURE OF JUSTICE BY THE CONTINUED

DETENTION OF THESE MATERIAL WITNESSES THAT CAN'T BE SATISFIED

BY THE TAKING OF THE DEPOSITION. AND I BELIEVE THAT THAT'S

THE MORE IMPORTANT FACTOR TO CONSIDER HERE. AND SO, COULD

YOU ADDRESS THAT?

MR. GILMORE: THAT IS THE OVERRIDING CONCERN OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT, WHICH I QUOTED AT LENGTH IN MY POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ABOUT THE TWO YOUNG MEN BEING THE SOLE SUPPORT FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE FAMILIES. I HAVE YET TO SEE ANY CASE LAW THAT SAYS I NEED TO GET SOME KIND OF DEPOSITION FROM THEIR MOTHERS AND FATHERS, AND DO THEY HAVE, I DON'T KNOW, A COW IN THE BACKYARD THAT WOULD COUNT AS PROPERTY? IT GETS RIDICULOUS IF YOU START TO GO THAT FAR. BUT AS FAR AS A FAILURE OF JUSTICE GOES, WE'RE LOOKING AT CUSTODY.

NOW THAT WE HAVE ONE OUT ON BOND, WE HAVE TWO YOUNG MEN WHO CAME HERE TO WORK BECAUSE THEIR FAMILIES NEEDED THE INCOME. THEY ARE HERE, BY THAT FACT ALONE, SHOULD INDICATE THAT THEY CAME TO GET MONEY TO HELP THEIR FAMILIES, AND IT'S A HARDSHIP TO THEIR FAMILIES WHEN THEY DON'T HAVE THE MONEY

PROVIDED.

IT'S A FAILURE OF JUSTICE FOR THESE TWO GENTLEMEN
WHO HAVE NEVER BEEN CHARGED WITH THE CRIME, AND WHO WILL NOT
BE CHARGED WITH THE CRIME, TO HAVE BEEN IN CUSTODY SINCE
MARCH 25TH, SOLELY BECAUSE THEY DON'T HAVE A SURETY THAT CAN
STEP FORWARD AND PAY THEIR BOND. AND THAT'S WHAT THE BASIS
OF, NOT ONLY THE TORRES-RUIZ CASE, WHICH OVERRULED JUDGE HUFF
IN A VERY SIMILAR CASE, AND SET THE PRECEDENT HERE IN
CALIFORNIA, I CITED FIFTH CIRCUIT CASES.

THE BLACK LETTER LAW IS THAT IT WOULD BE A FAILURE OF JUSTICE TO CONTINUE TO KEEP THEM. AND AS THE US ATTORNEY SAYS IN THE COMPLAINT, BOTH THE WITNESSES WERE ARRESTED AT A SAFE HOUSE AND IDENTIFIED THE DEFENDANTS AS THEIR GUIDES.

THAT TESTIMONY CAN CERTAINLY BE SECURED BY A DEPOSITION.

YES, THOSE WERE THE GUYS THAT LED US ACROSS.

SECONDLY, THE TESTIMONY THAT, YES, WE ARE ILLEGAL ALIENS, THAT IS THE PRIME EVIDENCE THAT THE GOVERNMENT WOULD NEED IN THESE TYPE OF CASES. IT'S NOT THAT UNUSUAL A CASE.

AND, OF COURSE, THERE IS A THIRD LIVE WITNESS WHO'S ON BOND, WHO WOULD BE AVAILABLE TO TESTIFY AT TRIAL OR EVEN TO INTERVIEW PRE-TRIAL, THROUGH DEPOSITIONS, SHOULD DEFENSE OR PROSECUTION REQUIRE IT. BUT IT'S CLEARLY, UNDER THE LAW, A FAILURE OF JUSTICE TO CONTINUE TO DETAIN THESE PEOPLE WHO HAVE NOT BEEN CHARGED WITH ANY CRIME. THANK YOU.

MR. SER: YOUR HONOR, THE ONLY POINT, NO WHERE IN

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

THE DECLARATION DOES IT SAY THIS IS THE SOLE, OR THESE MEN ARE THE SOLE BREAD WINNERS AND SUPPORTERS FOR THEIR FAMILIES. JUST THAT THEY WERE TRYING TO FIND WORK TO SUPPORT FAMILY MEMBERS IN THAT THEY WERE THE SOLE MEANS OF SUPPORT FOR ANYBODY, WHICH CERTAINLY WAS SOMETHING THAT THE COURT IN TORRES TOOK UNDER CONSIDERATION AND EXPRESSLY DISCUSSED IN THE OPINION IN TERMS OF DETERMINING OR BALANCING, AT LEAST, THE NEEDS OF THE DEFENDANT VERSUS THE NEEDS OF THE MATERIAL WITNESS IN THAT CASE IN ARRIVING AT THE ULTIMATE CONCLUSION. SO, I DO THINK IT'S A FACT THAT THE COURT NEEDS TO TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION HERE. AND AS FOR SITTING IN CUSTODY, THE FACT OF THE 13 MATTER IS, IT ALWAYS HAS BEEN REPRESENTED IN THESE CASES, THEY COULD BE CHARGED AS 1325 OR 1326 DEFENDANTS. SO, THEIR OWN WRONGDOING NECESSARILY SHOULD BE WEIGHED AS WELL IN TERMS OF DETERMINING WHETHER THEY SHOULD OR SHOULDN'T BE DEPOSED IN 16 THE MATTER. THE COURT: HAVE YOU, MR. CARRIEDO, OR YOU, MR. SER, LOOKED AT THE MATERIAL WITNESS DEPOSITION ORDER THAT 20 HAS BEEN PROVIDED TO THE COURT? MR. SER: I HAVE NOT HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO IT, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: IT APPEARS TO ME TO BE THE STANDARD 24 ORDER THAT I SEE FROM TIME TO TIME IN THESE KIND OF CASES. MR. GILMORE: IT'S EVEN ON THE WEBSITE.

1 MR. SER: AS LONG AS THE ORDER -- I WILL LET YOUR HONOR FINISH. 2 3 THE COURT: NO, GO AHEAD. MR. SER: I HAVEN'T SEEN THE RECENT -- I DON'T KNOW 4 IF THIS IS AN OLD ORDER OR RECENT ORDER, BUT I KNOW IN THE 5 PAST THE PRIMARY CONCERN WE HAVE ALWAYS HAD, IF THE COURT'S 6 7 GOING TO SIGN THE ORDER, IS THAT THE LENGTH AND THE AMOUNT OF TIME THAT MR. FAKHOURY OR MR. CARRIEDO WOULD HAVE TO BRING A 8 9 MOTION TO RE-DEPOSE OR DELAY SOME SORT OF RELEASE FROM 10 CUSTODY AFTER THE DEPOSITION. THE CONCERN OBVIOUSLY IS IF THE DEPOSITION GOES ALL DAY, WE END THE DEPOSITION, OR 11 12 MR. CARRIEDO AND MR. FAKHOURY END THE DEPOSITION AFTER YOUR 13 HONOR HAS LEFT THE BENCH, AND BUSINESS WITH THE COURT HAS 14 BEEN CONCLUDED FOR THE DAY, THAT THIS DOESN'T LEAVE ANY 15 OPPORTUNITY FOR DEFENSE COUNSEL TO COME BACK TO YOUR HONOR TO REQUEST EITHER A SECOND DEPOSITION AND A DELAY BASED ON 16 17 WHATEVER WAS LEARNED AT THE TIME OF THE DEPOSITION. 18 SO, AS LONG AS THE PROPOSED ORDER YOUR HONOR IS 19 GOING TO SIGN IT SOMEHOW AFFORDS THAT OPPORTUNITY FOR 20 MR. FAKHOURY TO COME BACK, SAY IN 24 HOURS, AND EXTEND THE 21 RELEASE ONE DAY, I'M FAMILIAR WITH THE ORDERS THAT HAVE BEEN 22 USED, THAT WOULD BE FINE WITH THAT LANGUAGE. 23

MR. GILMORE: YOUR HONOR, IF I MAY, I THINK IT'S

THE LAST PARAGRAPH OR TWO OF THE ORDER WHICH IS TAKEN OFF THE

COURT WEBSITE, PROVIDES COUNSEL 24 HOURS IN WHICH TO SCHEDULE

24

25

1 A HEARING IF THEY OBJECT TO THE RELEASE OF THE WITNESS AFTER THE DEPOSITION HAS CONCLUDED. 2 MR. SER: AS LONG AS THAT'S INCLUDED, THAT'S FINE, YOUR HONOR. 4 THE COURT: THAT'S WHAT, PARAGRAPH 18, WHICH IS THE 5 FINAL PARAGRAPH, IT INDICATES AND IT'S EVEN UNDERLINED HERE. 6 7 MY INCLINATION A MONTH OR SO AGO WHEN WE FIRST HEARD THIS HAS NOW RIPENED INTO SOMETHING I FEEL THAT OUGHT 8 9 TO BE GRANTED, THE MOTION TO DEPOSE THESE WITNESSES OUGHT TO 10 BE GRANTED. I BELIEVE RULE 15, FEDERAL RULES OF CRIMINAL 11 PROCEDURE, TITLE 18, SECTION 3144, AND THE CASE LAW ALL POINT 12 13 TO THE GRANTING OF THIS REQUEST TO DEPOSE THESE MATERIAL 14 WITNESSES, EVEN ABSENT A STATEMENT IN THE DECLARATION THAT 15 THESE MATERIAL WITNESSES ARE THE SOLE SUPPORT. NOW, WHY I THINK THAT WAS A FACTOR IN TORRES-RUIZ, I DON'T BELIEVE THAT 16 THAT WAS THE DETERMINATIVE FACTOR. AND SO, THE MOTION TO 17 18 TAKE THE DEPOSITION OF THESE TWO REMAINING IN CUSTODY --19 ACTUALLY, ALL THE MATERIAL WITNESSES, EVEN THE ONE THAT'S OUT 20 ON BOND, IS HEREBY GRANTED. NOW, LET'S TALK ABOUT A DATE. YOU MENTIONED 21 22 TUESDAY OR THURSDAY OF NEXT WEEK, MR. GILMORE? 23 MR. GILMORE: THAT'S FINE WITH ME, AND I BELIEVE IT 24 WAS OKAY WITH ONE OF COUNSEL. I WASN'T SURE. 25 MR. CARRIEDO: I COULD DO IT ON THURSDAY OF NEXT

```
1
     WEEK. I HAVE A FEW HEARINGS THAT DAY, I HAVE TO GET PEOPLE
     TO COVER FOR ME ON SOME HEARINGS IN FEDERAL COURT.
 2
               THE COURT: MR. SER, DO YOU HAPPEN TO HAVE
 3
     MR. FAKHOURY'S CALENDAR?
 4
               MR. SER: I HAVE MY CALENDAR, BUT HE GAVE ME GOOD
 5
     AND BAD DATES, AS LONG AS IT'S NOT THE WEEK OF THE 21ST OR
 6
 7
     28TH, IT WOULD BE FINE. THE ONLY CONCERN, AND I'M NOT SO
     FAMILIAR WITH THIS THAT I WOULD BE SURE, I DON'T KNOW WHAT
 8
 9
     THE STATUS OF THE DISCOVERY BEING PROVIDED IS. OBVIOUSLY WE
10
     WOULD WANT THAT BEFORE THE DEPOSITION SO MR. FAKHOURY CAN
     REVIEW THAT AND INCORPORATE THAT INTO HIS QUESTIONS, IF
11
12
     NECESSARY.
13
               THE COURT: MR. MILLER, HAS THAT DISCOVERY BEEN
14
     PROVIDED?
15
               MR. MILLER: NO, IT HAS NOT BEEN PROVIDED YET.
               THE COURT: THAT'S JUST, WHAT, THE COLOR
16
17
     PHOTOGRAPH, IS THAT THE ADDITIONAL --
18
               MR. MILLER: THAT'S THE REQUEST.
19
               MR. SER: NEXT THURSDAY SHOULDN'T BE A PROBLEM AS
20
     SOON AS HE GETS THE COLOR PHOTOGRAPH TO MR. FAKHOURY, BEFORE
21
     THAT.
22
               MR. CARRIEDO: I WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT, YOUR
23
     HONOR, ON FRIDAY THE 18TH, I AM NOT AVAILABLE.
24
               THE COURT: OKAY. SO, YOU'RE CONTEMPLATING IF THIS
25
     SHOULD SPILL OVER INTO THE FOLLOWING DAY?
```

1 MR. CARRIEDO: THAT'S CORRECT. 2 THE COURT: MR. MILLER, IS THE 17TH OF JUNE, NEXT THURSDAY, AVAILABLE TO YOU? 3 4 MR. MILLER: YES. 5 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. MR. GILMORE, THAT'S AVAILABLE TO YOU? 6 MR. GILMORE: YES, SIR. 7 THE COURT: I WOULD PROPOSE STARTING THIS AT 9:00 8 9 A.M. 10 MR. GILMORE: THAT WOULD BE FINE. MR. MILLER: YES. 11 THE COURT: EVERYBODY IS IN AGREEMENT ON THAT? ALL 12 13 RIGHT. IF FOR SOME REASON THE DEPOSITION GOES ON THROUGHOUT 14 THE DAY ON THURSDAY AND CAN'T CONCLUDE BY THE TIME NECESSARY 15 TO GET THE MATERIAL WITNESSES BACK AT THE END OF THE DAY, I 16 SUPPOSE WE WOULD HAVE TO FIND ANOTHER TIME TO CONCLUDE THE 17 MATERIAL WITNESSES BECAUSE MR. CARRIEDO HAS REPRESENTED HERE 18 TODAY THAT HE SIMPLY IS UNAVAILABLE ON THE FOLLOWING DAY, THE 18TH. I WOULD HOPE THAT THE DEPOSITIONS COULD CONCLUDE IN 19 20 THAT SINGLE DAY AND PROBABLY SHOULD, BUT I DON'T KNOW ALL THE FACTS OF THE CASE, AND SO I'M NOT GOING TO PRESUME AND I'M 21 22 CERTAINLY NOT GOING TO LIMIT --23 MR. GILMORE: I WOULD BE AVAILABLE OBVIOUSLY -- THE 24 NEXT AVAILABLE DAY WOULD BE MONDAY OR TUESDAY OF THE 25 FOLLOWING WEEK IS GOOD WITH ME, IF WE COULD RESOLVE THAT

1 ISSUE RIGHT HERE? 2 MR. SER: THAT DOESN'T WORK FOR MR. FAKHOURY. HE'S 3 IN TRIAL. THE COURT: THAT'S RIGHT. THE FOLLOWING WEEK HE'S 4 5 UNAVAILABLE. MR. CARRIEDO: I'M IN TRIAL THE FOLLOWING WEEK IN 6 7 FRONT OF JUDGE BURNS. 8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. HERE'S WHAT I'M GOING TO 9 DO, DO THE BEST YOU CAN TO GET IT ALL DONE. KEEP YOUR 10 QUESTIONS CONCISE AND RELEVANT, MATERIAL TO THE FACTS OF THE CASE AND THE ISSUES, AND THERE'S PROBABLY NO REASON WHY IT 11 12 CAN'T ALL CONCLUDE IN ONE DAY. KEEP YOUR BREAKS SHORT, AND 13 PRESS ON. AT THE END OF THE DAY IF YOU ARE NOT FINISHED, I 14 WOULD HOPE THAT THE PARTIES CAN AGREE, WHILE THEY SIT THERE, 15 TO A FOLLOW-ON DAY TO CONCLUDE THE DEPOSITIONS. BEYOND THAT, 16 I'M NOT GOING TO MAKE AN ORDER FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK BECAUSE 17 MR. FAKHOURY IS IN TRIAL, MR. CARRIEDO IS IN TRIAL, AND I 18 THINK EVEN THE WEEK OF THE 28TH YOU INDICATED, MR. SER, THAT 19 MR. FAKHOURY IS UNAVAILABLE, MAYBE FOR THE SAME REASON, I'M 20 NOT SURE. MR. SER: HE HAS BACK-TO-BACK TRIALS FOR TWO WEEKS. 21 THE COURT: OKAY. SO, LET'S DO -- IF YOU CAN'T 22 23 RESOLVE IT, IF FOR SOME REASON IT DOES SPILL OVER TO THE

THE COURT: OKAY. SO, LET'S DO -- IF YOU CAN'T
RESOLVE IT, IF FOR SOME REASON IT DOES SPILL OVER TO THE
FOLLOWING DAY AND YOU CAN'T RESOLVE IT, THEN I'M SURE I WILL
HEAR ABOUT IT AND WE'LL GET BACK TOGETHER.

24

25

1 MR. GILMORE: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. 2 THE COURT: DO WHAT YOU CAN. SO, HANG ON HERE. I'M GOING TO ENTER THE ORDER THAT SAYS, "SHALL BE DEPOSED ON JUNE 17, 2010, AT 9:00 A.M." MR. MILLER, YOU'RE FAMILIAR 4 WITH THE ORDER, SO YOU KNOW WHAT RESPONSIBILITIES THE US 5 ATTORNEY'S OFFICE HAS IN GETTING THE MATERIAL WITNESSES 6 7 THERE, THE DEFENDANTS THERE, THE VIDEOGRAPHER AND THE WHOLE BIT. SO, I'M NOT GOING TO REPEAT ALL THAT. YOU'LL HAVE THE 8 9 ORDER. MR. CARRIEDO: AND THE COURT'S ORDER IS FOR ALL 10 THREE MATERIAL WITNESSES? 11 12 THE COURT: YES, INCLUDING THE ONE THAT'S OUT ON 13 BOND. NOW, IF FOR SOME REASON THE ONE WHO'S OUT ON BOND 14 DOESN'T APPEAR, THEN WE'LL HAVE TO DEAL WITH THAT WHEN THAT 15 HAPPENS. BUT I'M LESS CONCERNED WITH THAT PERSON AT THIS MOMENT. BUT THE ORDER IS, IS THAT THAT PERSON SHOULD BE 16 17 DEPOSED TOO. ANYTHING FURTHER? 18 MR. GILMORE: NO, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU FOR YOUR 19 CONCERN. I APPRECIATE IT. 20 THE COURT: OKAY. 21 (WHICH WERE ALL THE PROCEEDINGS 22 HELD IN THE ABOVE ENTITLED CAUSE.) 23 24 25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO 4) SS. 5 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 6 7 I, MELISSA A. PIERSON, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, REGISTERED 8 PROFESSIONAL REPORTER, IN AND FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT 9 COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY 10 CERTIFY THAT I REPORTED, STENOGRAPHICALLY, THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS AT THE TIME AND PLACE HEREINBEFORE SET FORTH; 11 12 THAT THE SAME WAS THEREAFTER REDUCED TO TYPEWRITTEN FORM BY 13 MEANS OF COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION; AND I DO FURTHER 14 CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION OF MY 15 STENOGRAPHIC NOTES. 16 17 18 DATE: 4-26-11 19 20 S:/MELISSA A. PIERSON 21 MELISSA A. PIERSON, CSR 12499 RPR 22 FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 23 2.4 25